

1 THOMAS E. PEREZ
Assistant Attorney General
2 PATRICIA A. SUMNER
Trial Attorney
3 U.S. Department of Justice
601 D Street NW, 5th Floor
4 Washington, DC 20530
Telephone: (202) 616-4719
5 Facsimile: (202) 514-8336

6 DANIEL G. BOGDEN
United States Attorney
7 NICHOLAS D. DICKINSON
Assistant United States Attorney
8 333 Las Vegas Boulevard
Suite 5000
9 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
(702) 388-6336
10 (Fax) 388-6418

11 Attorneys for the **UNITED STATES**

12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
13 DISTRICT OF NEVADA
14

15 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
16 Plaintiff,

17 vs.

18 ROSS HACK,
19 MELISSA HACK, and
LELAND JONES

20 Defendants.
21
22

12-CR-0063-PMP-RJJ

**STIPULATION AND ORDER TO
EXTEND DEADLINE FOR
GOVERNMENT'S RESPONSE TO
DEFENDANT MELISSA HACK'S
MOTION FOR REVOCATION OF
DETENTION**

23 IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED by and between the Defendant,
24 MELISSA HACK, by and through her counsel, E. Brent Bryson, Esq. of the law offices of E. Brent
25 Bryson, Ltd., and the Plaintiff, the United States of America, by and through its attorneys, Patricia
26 A. Sumner and Nicholas Dickinson, that the deadline for the government's response to defendant
27 Melissa Hack's Motion for Revocation of Detention currently scheduled for December 31, 2012,
28 be vacated and extended to January 9, 2013, a date mutually agreeable to the parties, in order to

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

ROSS HACK,
MELISSA HACK, and
LELAND JONES

Defendants.

12-CR-0063-PMP-RJJ

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND ORDER

Based upon the pending stipulation of counsel and good cause appearing therefore, the Court finds that:

1. The Defendant, Melissa Hack, does not object to the government's request for an extension of time to file its responses to the Defendant's Motion for Revocation of Detention.

2. That it is in the interests of justice to allow counsel for the government sufficient time to adequately prepare a response to the Defendant's motion, and that a miscarriage of justice may occur if the deadline is not extended, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.

3. The additional time requested by this stipulation is excludable in computing the time within which the trial herein must commence pursuant to the Speedy Trial Act, Title 18, United States Code, Section 3161(h)(7)(A), when considering the factors under Title 18, United States Code Sections 3161(h)(7)(B)(i) and 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).

4. This is the first request for an extension of the deadline for the government's response to the Defendant's motion.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Based upon the foregoing findings of fact, the Court makes the following conclusions of law.

1. The ends of justice served by granting said extension outweigh the best interest of the public and the Defendant in a speedy trial, since the failure to grant said extension would be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice, would deny the parties herein sufficient time and the opportunity with which to be able to effectively and thoroughly respond to the Defendant's motion, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.

2. The extension sought herein is excludable under the Speedy Trial Act, Title 18, United States Code Section 3161(h)(7)(A), when considering the factors under Title 18, United States Code Sections 3161(h)(7)(B)(i), 3161(h)(B)(7)(ii), and 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).

ORDER

Based upon the Stipulation of the parties, and good cause appearing therefore;

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the government's response to the Defendant's Motion for Revocation of Detention must be submitted to the Court by January 9, 2013.

IT IS FURTHER HEREBY ORDERED that the Defendant's reply to the government's response to the Defendant's motion must be submitted to the Court by January 16, 2013.

DATED this _26th day of December, 2012.


Senior United States District Judge